naspa Journal

Vol. 13, No. 1, Summer 1975

CONFERENCE ISSUE

Rhatigan
Kreps
Brown
Cheek
Kaiser
Crookston

naspa Journal

Vol. 13, No. 1, Summer 1975

Published by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

2 Editor's Note

4 President's Remarks: The Ecology of the Learning Environment
James J. Rhatigan

GENERAL SESSION ADDRESSES

8 The Economy of the Learning Environment
Juanita M. Kreps

14 Interpretation and Views of Students Searching for Beliefs
Robert McAfee Brown

25 The impact of National Trends in Higher Education
King. V. Cheek, Jr.

THEME SESSION

33 Designing Campus Environments
Leland R. Kaiser

PANEL PRESENTATIONS

40 Designing Campus Ecosystems
Ursula Delworth, Robert Svob, Michael Ford, Kent Hawley

45 Milieu Management
Burns B. Crookston

56 Regular Feature: The Bookshelf
Carnegie Commission Reports: *Anthony J. Giannelli, John P. Dunlop, Daryl Hagie, Annette Gibbs, Arnold G. Tew, Jan Kubik, Roberta Christie*
Arthur Chickering: *David L. Pierce, Walter B. Shaw*

64 Burns B. Crookston (1922-1975); A Colleague

Editor's Note

Most of us at one time or another have sought to calm nervous freshmen during orientation with the advice, "be yourself." Some add, "be your best self." Practical, supportive, to the point, we think. Now as the nervous freshman editor we find such advice is easier to give than to receive. Being authentic is hard; there is less risk in emulation.

Increasingly, authenticity has become a central theme in our plans. Many in NASPA have pointed out the importance of the *Journal* as a "window" to the work of the Association and student affairs professionals. We hope to make it an open window with a straightforward view of student affairs as it strives to become its "best self."

Part of being authentic is recognizing and respecting one's uniqueness. Student affairs, despite its wide range of disparate activities, is whole and unique. The reality of our work most often is found in the practical, day-to-day, human exchanges between student affairs professionals and those with whom they work and live. Our ambitions, for the most part, are that the lives we touch are helped to grow. Our creative visions usually focus on improving the quality of life within our institutions.

As professionals we apply knowledge from many disciplines to an arena of administrative and human activity defined by the human and bureaucratic needs we serve. The urgent rhythms of our working environment seldom allow for a measured polishing of responses to complex and often obscured events. The scope, pace, and situational nature of our work precludes for most of us a traditional scholar's focus. We are instead scholars of experience: administrative, educational, and human development generalists.

Student affairs professionals, therefore, are best understood as practitioners in the organization and delivery of human services in colleges and universities. In the *Journal* we plan to examine the data of this experience as it brings us increased understanding of student affairs practice and interacts with the development of the body of theory, principles, and belief undergirding that practice.

This issue introduces a new annual feature, the conference issue. The conference issue contains the General Session addresses and several selected special interest sessions. Subsequent issues will present other theme session presentations as a continuing conference feature. The editors appreciate the cooperation of the Program Committee in making conference materials available, especially its chairperson, Dr. Alice Manicur, Conference Program Committee Chairperson and NASPA President-Elect.

In bringing the conference to *Journal* readers we hope many will be encouraged to share reactions, thoughts, questions, or prepare formal papers. Letters and reactions will be considered for the "opinion" feature. Please keep these brief, 200-400 words.

We are delighted to be able to share the conference with those NASPA members who were unable to attend, and with others interested in what student affairs professionals are discussing. We hope, too, that those who did attend will discover again the richness of the San Franccisco experience.

D.C.T.

NASPA 1976 DALLAS CONFERENCE

The Dallas Fairmont
March 28-31

"THE STUDENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION – LEARNING STYLES, IMPACTS, AND VALUES"

1976 — The bicentennial year of our nation — is an appropriate time for our professional association to focus its attention directly upon our "reason for being" — the students. It is a time to reflect upon the assumptions we have about students, our institutions, and learning itself. It is a time to ask ourselves questions about our work and its implications for students, as we view our profession with a historical perspective in mind.

The 1976 NASPA conference will be about students — who they are, how they learn, what effect our institutions have on them, and what values we teach them — if any. Emphasis will be placed upon the implications of these matters for us as student affairs administrators.

There will be major speakers, interest sessions, topic discussions, educational displays, debate, workshops, entertainment, and perhaps most importantly, time to share ideas and problems with professional colleagues and friends. The conference committee is dedicated to making the 1976 Dallas NASPA conference one that will be stimulating and enjoyable. We hope to see you at the Fairmont, March 28-31, 1976.

James J. Rhatigan

President's Remarks: The Ecology of the Learning Environment

Improved communication between and among researchers and practitioners is seen as an important step toward the improvement of colleges and universities.

The theme of this conference suggests that the college is a system. This is not a startling revelation. System is one of the chic words of the last decade, at least for students. Beyond these casual observations, however, are the subtleties of the matter. Despite forty years of research, no general fullfledged theory has yet emerged to explain or describe the process of higher education.

We concede that the problems associated with environmental research are complex, and that some of the findings and suggestions do not appear to have sufficient generalizable properties to be useful. The increased attention given to investigations in this area during the past fifteen years, nevertheless, has resulted in an outstanding development of the literature.

Even though a holistic theory has not yet emerged, administrators are being asked, nonetheless, to make decisions which bear on the environments of their individual campuses. One could say that these demands are made of administrators almost daily. One way to deal with this intelligently, of course, is to examine those programs that seem to enable students to meet their goals, even if their conceptual underpinnings are less than fully understood. This conference can serve such a purpose, and I hope that it will. I hope together we can identify the factors — activities, settings, methods, timing, student involvement — that make our efforts successful.

FORTY YEARS OF RESEARCH ON CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTS

As mentioned earlier, research relating to campus environments has been conducted for some forty years. Theodore Newcomb, whose contributions to the literature have been formally recognized by NASPA at this conference, pioneered in this area when he undertook his comprehensive study of Bennington College women. This study served as a model for several years and is among the most extensive assessments of a single group of students, even to this day. Newcomb attempted to delineate, for the first time, an entire student culture and the impact of the college on that culture. True to his style, and to his credit, Professor Newcomb's co-authorship (with Kenneth Feldman) of *The Impact of College on Students,* some twenty-five years after the publication of the Bennington study, is itself a classic, and probably the most beneficial research document for student affairs administrators that can be found anywhere.

As best I can determine, the late George Stern first used the explicit words "the application of ecological principles" in attempting to explain the relationship

---

James J. Rhatigan, NASPA President 1975-76, is Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas. This address was delivered as the opening remarks of the 57th Annual NASPA Conference in San Francisco, March 30, 1975.

between person and environment. He became interested in this problem in the middle '50's when studying students with authoritarian personalities. Stern noted that these students made unique adaptations to what appeared, superficially, to be a common environment. He eventually found that these students viewed their environment in many different ways, ways that were puzzling to an impartial observer. Intrigued by this, Stern joined with a colleague, C. Robert Pace, and developed two instruments, the Activities Index (AI) and the College Characteristics Index (the CCI) in order to examine the college setting in a way it had not been examined before. In designing these instruments Pace and Stern drew on the 1938 work of H. A. Murray who had proposed a system for classifying the organizational tendencies that appeared to give direction and unity to personality. Murray called these tendencies "needs" and they formed the basis for the AI.

The external counterpart of the personality "need", according to Murray, was the environmental "press", a term with more than one meaning, but which became the basis for the CCI (an attempt to identify environmental factors affecting students). As Stern said, "From a subjective point of view (the environmental press) describes the private world of the individual, the unique view each person has of the events around him." But Stern felt that eventually a person's private world merges with that of others; people who share a common ideology, whose responses to an environment coalesce, and who may be quite different in these respects from others around them.

We have moved in recent years from the AI-CCI to a variety of other instruments, but the importance to this conference of the Pace and Stern work is to suggest that it is possible, at least in an incomplete and rudimentary way, to identify the diversity of American colleges and their student bodies using the need-press terms. Pace and Stern laid the groundwork for exploring the significance of congruence or dissonance in the relationships between the characteristics of a student, or a student group, or a student type, and the corresponding demands, characteristics, and opportunities of the institutional environment. It was Stern who first noted that, while sweet milk comes from contented cows, precious pearls come from irritated oysters. He observed, however, that it would be an exercise in futility to try to get milk from an oyster. We are still perplexed by the educational implications of this fascinating research.

CAMPUS ENVIRONMENTS TODAY

To what extent do we try to provide a congenial, compatible, comfortable environment? To what extent do we try to provide the psychic strength and flexibility to enable our graduates to flourish in very diverse environments? To what extent must these questions be answered on an individual basis?

A substantial amount of the early work relating to environments involved full-time students on residential campuses. Things have changed considerably since then. Pat Cross has indicated that students today are necessarily responsive to a wider, more complex social and cultural matrix than were previous students. Pressures and influences from off-campus are powerful and may, or may not, be congruent with the environment a student encounters on-campus. Rural poor, blue collar white, minority students, veterans, women, older, and part-time students (in varying combinations) are entering our institutions in increasing numbers. Problems encountered in the past decade with this expanding clientele often have been painful both to students and to their institutions. We need to study the successful adjustments, and to understand why others failed. The complex circumstances of these

new students require a different emphasis from much of the excellent work done with students prior to this point. Some of the most creative responses have been at community colleges (the new institutions). We need to examine these experiences for what they can add to person/environment research and our understanding of how students develop.

Progress needs to be made on two fronts: (1) We need additional research of a conceptual, synoptic type. It is realistic to assume that this research will not be undertaken by working administrators, although we have a responsibility to promote and to share in such efforts. A multifaceted approach is needed for a project of such dimensions. Very likely no one discipline is capable of it. (2) Pending the development of such research, we need to rely on practices that seem to enable selected students to meet their goals. This implies a call for a smaller scale, segmented research of the sort that practitioners are equipped to make. Also it requires increased efforts to identify research successfully done that may have generalizable properties. Chickering, for example, feels strongly about this latter point, arguing that we need to use better that which already is known.

I believe a major purpose of this conference is to discover how student affairs administrators can borrow and adapt in intelligent, creative, concrete, purposeful ways. We need to be realistic about the goals of a brief conference, but I believe that stimulation from the work of others and the sharing of our own perceived successes are worthy reasons for proceeding. I hope that information gained here will be useful to you when you return home: a more precise orientation to the issues we face would, in itself, be beneficial.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

We need to appreciate the relationship of theory and effective practice. For this reason I believe it is particularly appropriate that NASPA has honored Nevitt Sanford at this conference. His long and detailed interest in the environment of higher education is worthy of NASPA's special recognition. *The American College,* for example, remains fresh and timeless. I don't know if the selection committee had that one single work in mind, or not. In my view their choice could not have been better. Although I have never met Nevitt Sanford until this time, I am indebted to him even beyond his contributions to the literature. If I had my way, I would specifically honor him for the Wright Institute, which he directs.

In 1969, my University sent five people to the Wright Institute, one of them for eight weeks. The campus has never been the same. The University had at that time (and still does) an assistant dean who dreamed of what he might do for young people coming to our campus from adverse economic circumstances, many of them, like himself, from minority homes, if only he could develop the resources. He was able to bring order to his thinking at the Wright Institute and Project TOGETHER came into being on my campus. A group of "high risk" students, many of whom, according to statistical predictions, had no business in succeeding, are now graduates of our institution. Two have gone on to medical school and several more to law school. Others are in graduate pursuits, or are working at jobs that surely were perceived as beyond their reach just a few short years ago.

Have we developed our full potential? Surely not. Dean Blake, the project director, has a list of things to do as long as the list he had before, but it's a better list. In the process the University has learned from its students how to grow and adjust

for their benefit. Similarly, students in the program have learned and adapted to what the University holds as important. This is but one example of the many experiences that could be shared by each of us. That sharing is what I hope will transpire here, and at every other opportunity we can create for ourselves.

Whether we are student personnel administrators or academic administrators I believe that during this conference we will remind ourselves of our interdependence; our need to help each other regardless of our positions. No one conference, or one book, or perhaps one lifetime is sufficient to solve the problems we face. But our energy, our ideas, our sense of purpose, and our view of ourselves are important in the quest. Perhaps our meeting together will, in a small way, contribute to these good ends. Samuel Johnson once said, "of the blessings set before you, make your choice." I believe we are blessed in having an opportunity to work in genuinely human ways in behalf of the growth and development of students. But we will have to choose how to proceed.

Academic Administrators' Conference Notes

In the spirit of the 1975 conference theme, Ecology of the Learning Environment, NASPA invited a number of academic administrators to join their student affairs colleagues. A meeting was held to discuss their perceptions and to share thoughts for the future. The informality of the session prevents a comprehensive formal report. The following, however, gives some flavor of the discussion.

"The bringing of chief academic officers to the NASPA meeting in San Francisco was significant and successful, and we urge that it be done again at the conference next year at Dallas." Donald R. Gerth, Vice President for Academic Affairs, California State University, Chico.

Academic administrators recognize a need to discuss seriously with student affairs administrators . . . 1. major educational issues, 2. the implications of emerging organizational models for higher educational institutions, 3. the increased movement of student affairs into educational programs, 4. the scope of the student affairs role (definitions of student affairs), 5. the nature of the we-they gap (it is seen as real): is the ultimate gap faculty-administrator? 6. the impact of collective bargaining, 7. the consequences of budget competition, 8. the need for increased student affairs support for academic programs such as experimental learning, academic, and career advising.

At the campus level there was support for increased student affairs-academic interaction. Meetings to describe programs and to consult on program development were urged. Also, it was suggested that there be staff exchanges, internships and "internal sabbaticals" as methods to increase practical understanding of campus issues and, ultimately, to errode the traditional distance between academics and student affairs professionals.

Although this session represents a student affairs initiative to increase communication with academic administrators, the sense is that significant change is dependent upon the development of leadership from the academic side. This could emerge from a common concern regarding student development, the increasing demands on higher education for broad social services, and the need to collaborate in discussions with faculty regarding the implications of these impending changes.

GENERAL SESSION ADDRESSES

Juanita M. Kreps

The Economy and the Learning Environment

Despite a forbidding economic forecast, opportunities for positive developments are proposed, such as a new emphasis on educational quality and the expansion of life-long learning for a larger proportion of the population.

NASPA is a much more swinging set than I am accustomed to joining. To a staid economist the titles in your program are baffling: "A Two-Headed Deanship in a Single Purpose College"; or "Matching Roommates to their Planetary Pattern"; or "Learning About Hard Knocks the Easy Way." Finally, as if to taunt my most cherished beliefs, you throw out the challenge: "Is Money Everything?" If not money, our crowd would protest, what is there left to rely upon?

Your casual dismissal of the money problem may be the only sensible reaction to today's financial dilemma. Certainly economists are not offering any alternative solutions. We are more likely these days to solve with great mathematical elegance those problems unlikely ever to occur. And we are, in all events, a gloomy lot. We bear out the proposition that ". . . there is a strain in human thinking that calls for eternal foreboding, no matter what."[1] It is a joy to come over to your side for a while, leaving some of the gloom behind and, by your leave, sharing the rest of it with you.

Because you are a high-spirited group that has not yet given up on the world, you will find these economic questions challenging, but not overwhelming. You have learned to cope with student unrest, faculty arrogance, and administrative ambivalence. You should be able to battle economic stringency with the same grace under pressure. In a recession there are no enemies — at least, none on campus: the bad guys are all out there somewhere, while the rest of us are in this together. You will not let pessimism run wild, no matter what the economists tell you, knowing that to do so is to create the problems we fear. And while a look ahead may tell us how the forces are shaping up, it cannot predict the outcome of interventions conceived by the human mind when we are determined to reshape these forces.

It is to these projections of the future that I must direct your thoughts, nevertheless. The economic outlook is not promising for the education "industry", either in the near or far term, for several reasons: one, the numbers of students of college age will decline significantly during the last quarter of this century; two, the rate of growth in the economy as a whole will probably remain low, even after we recover from the current recession, and this lower growth means reduced spending on education as well as other services; and finally, the supply of educated talent is

---

Juanita M. Kreps is Vice President and James B. Duke Professor of Economics, Duke University. Professor Kreps also is Chairperson, Task Force on Financing Higher Education of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, Association of American Colleges.

destined to grow faster than jobs with the result that career opportunities, particularly for young professionals, will be depressed for quite some time.

Consider each of these developments, in turn, and then the all-important question: what do they portend for the learning environment?

FEWER STUDENTS, SLOWER ECONOMIC GROWTH

The number of college-age youth is now leveling off, and will decline through at least the next two decades. This reversal in the high-growth pattern of the past quarter-century has already been reflected in lower enrollments in all types of institutions except the community colleges, but the competition for students will worsen in the years ahead.[2]

Projections of enrollment from the population size are not altogether reliable, since factors other than numbers of 18-24-year-olds affect the demand for higher education. Prior to the 1970's, the percentage of youth attending college changed markedly during two decades of rapid economic growth. Beginning in 1950 with an enrollment rate of only 14 percent, the proportion climbed steadily to 32.1 percent in 1970, dropping slightly to a 1972 rate of 31.0 percent. If the next two decades should see another doubling in the proportion of this age group attending college — so that two-thirds of all youth rather than one-third were in school — higher education would continue to be a growth industry. As Howard Bowen has pointed out, an increase in the enrollment rates of particular groups in the society (minorities, low-income youth, women) could have a marked effect on the total demand for higher education.[3]

The prospect of offsetting declining numbers of youth by increasing their proportions in college (and the proportions of other age groups as well) has great appeal, not only for the institutions facing severe losses in their enrollments, but also for those who have long advocated the extension of higher education to all who seek it, irrespective of socio-economic status. How much of an offset can actually be achieved is of course difficult to predict. But in our preoccupation with the numbers of persons in the age group from which colleges and universities draw the bulk of their students, it is easy to forget the fact that institutions of higher education are subject to the whims of the marketplace in much the same way as other industries; that these market forces influence not only endowments but also enrollments, particularly in the private institutions; that the impact of economic growth on the demand for higher education, although difficult to disentangle from other factors, needs to be written into our calculations. Current discussions of whether continued economic growth is possible or desirable are thus fundamental to our appraisal of the future status of postsecondary education.

ON THE ECONOMIC GROWTH DEBATE

Few of us have been spared the gloomy model of tomorrow's possible disaster drawn by the Club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind.[4] Yet a summary reminder sets the scene.

> Within the next century, many may face choices from a four-pronged dilemma — suppression of modern industrial society by a natural resource shortage; decline of world population from changes wrought by pollution; population limitation by food shortage; or population collapse from war, disease, and social stresses caused by physical and psychological crowding. We may now be living in a "Golden Age" when,

> in spite of a widely acknowledged feeling of malaise, the quality of life is, on the average, higher than ever before in history and higher now than the future offers.[5]

In the wake of such warnings, the question of future economic growth in the United States becomes more than an academic exercise. Although economists have sharply questioned the assumptions underlying the doomsday models,[6] few have questioned the probability of a future limit to aggregate growth. Discussion turns on the technical question of when the limit will be reached, given our present growth rate, and the social policy question of what should be done to retard the rate of our movement toward that limit and thus prevent the ultimate collapse described by the Club of Rome Model.

Although it would be easy to assume the problem away by proposing that we could grow without consuming resources too rapidly or destroying the environment by shifting from goods production with all its waste and pollution, to services — which presumably use only "clean" human resources — Lester Thurow reminds us that

> While it's true that services don't pollute directly, they generate a lot of indirect pollution . . . take education. Who is the largest consumer of electricity in the Boston area? . . . MIT. Who is the second largest? . . . the affiliated hospitals of Harvard. It's not at all obvious that we can have lots of health care and lots of education and still not have pollution or use of resources. It may be that when we add the direct and indirect aspects of these activities, they are, in fact, great polluters . . . until hard information is developed on who pollutes, and who doesn't, who uses resources and who doesn't, no growth should mean no growth for everyone.[7]

In short, there seems to be no easy way to take the purifying medicine of zero growth without suffering certain side effects. So the ecologists are forced to face the tradeoffs of increased output versus decreased pollution. What society and the ecologists have to face is the additional set of constraints imposed by natural resources and the supply of capital which together specify the rate at which we *can* grow, once we determine the desired pace.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INCOMES AND EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURES

These growth questions have important implications for higher education now and in the future. The zero growth, which has already hit academia because of circumstances peculiar to higher education, has brought with it a set of problems that may well signify things to come in the rest of the economy. Moreover, any educational goal must be considered within the context of a steady state in which educational resources are already under-utilized. For example, productivity improvements which reduce the need for faculty and staff merely worsen the present over-supply of academic talent.

But long-run effects of slowed economic growth on higher education may differ significantly from the effects of the current decline in college-age population. Indeed, the rate of growth will set our course far more dramatically than will changes in age structure. We have only to pose the central question of what happens to the distribution of income in a no-growth society to realize that the changes could be quite profound. Lester Thurow argues that income will be distributed less evenly under no-growth conditions (and given women's liberation, that income will be less evenly apportioned under growth as well); the only circumstance in which no-growth produces redistribution in favor of the poor is one in which a substantial negative rate of growth collapses the current structure and allows for drastic social change such as occurred in the Depression of the 1930's.[8]

During the second World War, a high growth era, the degree of income inequality was reduced because of full employment and high wages. Very little redistribution has occurred since that decade. Significant reductions in the numbers of poor people and in the percentage of the population classified as poor by the commonly used market-basket definition have taken place, nevertheless, because a growth in output enabled many low-income families to earn additional income. The question of whether this gradual decrease in the incidence of extreme poverty will continue in the absence of further growth is important to ask, when we set out to estimate the proportion of the population that will have access to higher education.

In addition to the distribution question, we need to remember that higher education has made vast strides in recent decades (as measured by the numbers and proportions of all youth attending college) because the rise in aggregate real income enabled the nation to pay for education without undue sacrifice of other goods and services. Moreover, since the major cost of education was the student's foregone income and since the return to investments in education have been quite high, there have been strong incentives to spend for higher education. Such incentives will probably be lessened by slowed growth; families will not continue to have rising real incomes, and the student's prospective increase in lifetime earnings will not be as great.

On the other hand, if slowed growth reduces job opportunities for the young to the point that governments allocate more public funds for education as a means of keeping a better balance between jobs and job seekers, we might well find ourselves providing education to twice the proportion of youth now being served. If the job market worsens, both education and retirement will be extended, and the trend toward shortening the males' worklife will continue.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE NEW ENVIRONMENT

If all this comes to pass — if the expected decline in student enrollments are accompanied by a slowing of economic growth which limits our capacity to spend for postsecondary education — what are the options before us? As innovators, as proponents of new programs and believers in the power of positive thinking, what can we hope to accomplish in this unpromising future?

Perhaps we should call to mind such reassurances as are available. To be of good cheer, let us distinguish first between the steady state condition and the stage in which we are cutting down in order to achieve a steady state. Slowing the pace of growth is far more painful, following rapid expansion such as we have experienced until recently, than merely standing still. Once the cut-backs have been made and some institutions have been forced to close or merge, the acute financial distress peculiar to the transition stage will be eased.

The problem of rising costs will surely persist, although again it seems likely that the pace of inflation will slow. Educators will continue to resist passing on all increased costs to the student (even if some students would pay) because of the belief that education should be publicly subsidized. Fortunately, a growing number of legislators seem to agree; witness the growth of state plans that make partial tuition payments to students in independent as well as public institutions.

But the most important sources of improvement will have to emerge from those of us in higher education. Here, for the first time in recent history, we are freed from the pressure of educating larger and larger numbers of students. We are

charged instead with the responsibility for improving educational quality. Why should we be less challenged by the need to raise the level of education of each student than by the necessity of turning out more and more students? Remember that in the past we have not had the option of concentrating on quality. And we do not know for sure, but it seems likely that improved education of fewer students will contribute as much to social well-being as merely maintaining a constant quality of an ever-increasing number of students.

Of course we have yet to define what we mean by improved education.

Quality is an elusive concept, admittedly, and educational excellence has been out of fashion for a while. It's non-egalitarian sound arouses an image of elitism. Increased productivity, on the other hand, is something we applaud as being worthwhile, work-related, somehow American. What we have not yet made explicit is productivity's reliance on the quality of education, a reliance all the more critical in an age when knowldege grows at a dizzying pace and when the capacity to be productive requires the absorption of more and more knowledge. High-quality education will not be achieved by pushing to reduce the time and money spent per student, but by concentrating instead on the student's ability to produce or render a service during the worklife that follows.

Both we and the students become impatient when asked to spend the time necessary to insure better educational quality. There was once a story about a young man with the unlikely name of Pyestock who went from one school to another trying to find a field he could learn in a hurry. He tried living with students on the left bank in Paris, but since he had never bothered to learn French, he found himself on the outside. He retreated to England to study, but the deliberate British and their respect for tradition annoyed him; he wanted to get on with his education, he kept complaining. The author commented that Pyestock was something of a Master of Arts at midday, demanding to be a certified plumber by three in the afternoon. Then this observation:

> Now you can be dubbed a knight in half a second,
> Become a hero or a corpse or a coward in three or four:
> But to become a plumber takes time.

Now, suddenly there is enough time to become a plumber, or whatever we in education are supposed to be helping students become. It is curious that we find the gift of time so frightening.

ON MEETING THE CHALLENGE

In weighing the probable consequences of slowed or zero growth for incomes, spending patterns and, in particular, spending for postsecondary education, one needs to apply what one knows of economic forces to predict where the cutbacks will occur if no intervening action is taken. Then one needs to postulate a series of policy decisions and trace the probable impact of each on the outcome. The second step is far more difficult, because it requires the imagination to conceptualize new approaches to financing education and the skill and persuasiveness to launch the necessary programs. In short, although growth and inflation problems make a healthy environment for higher education elusive, they do not make it impossible.

As the economic scene shifts, the kinds of interventions educators offer will change as well. On the higher education street corners, where the trade gossip is exchanged, one now hears some fairly astounding suggestions. The schemes

are not clear, but the same terms keep cropping up: lifetime learning, blue-collar sabbaticals, prepayment for college, drawing accounts of time and money. All of these new terms emerge from an implicit belief that we have reached a stage of economic development that permits a far greater expenditure of time and effort on education than has been available in the past. All reflect attempts to find ways to translate economic capacity into improved educational performance.

The future of higher education turns largely on how accurately we appraise both the constraints and the potentials of today's economy. On the constraint side, it is foolhardy not to recognize the slowed pace of growth and the increased rate of inflation. Aggregate real income is simply not going to rise at its past rate and neither is the size of the college-age population. On the other hand, the potential for expanding the proportion of the total population who share in post secondary education and for improving the quality of education offered is greater than ever before precisely because past growth rates and relative price stability have brought the economy to an extremely advanced stage. Not to recognize the range of options that lie ahead — to concentrate instead on the decline in traditional markets — is to continue to be

> . . . guided . . . by ideas that are relevant to another world; and as a result do many things that are unnecessary, some that are unwise, and a few that are insane.[9]

REFFERENCES

1 Jeb Fowles, "Humanity and its Gloom-Doom Prophets," *The Futurist,* VIII, June, 1974, p. 135.
2 The discussion which follows is taken from the author's "Higher Education in a Low-Growth, High-Inflation Economy," to be published by the American Council on Education in 1975.
3 Howard Bowen, "Higher Education: A Growth Industry?" mimeographed April, 1974.
4 D. H. Meadows, D. L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W. W. Behrens, *The Limits to Growth,* New York: Universe Books, 1972.
5 Jay Forrester, *World Dynamics,* Cambridge, Mass.: Wright-Allen Press, 1971.
6 See, especially, Robert Solow, "Is the End of the World at Hand?" in Andrew Weintraub et. al., *The Economic Growth Controversy,* New York: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1973, pp. 39-61.
7 Lester Thurow, "Zero Economic Growth and Income Distribution," in Andrew Weintraub, op. cit., p. 145.
8 Ibid., pp. 152-53
9 John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Affluent Society.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958, p. 3.

Trends in the Counseling of Women in Higher Education, 1957-1973

by Barbara S. Knox

Ruth Strang Research Award Monograph Series: No. 1

Barbara S. Knox, the winner of the 1975 Ruth Strang Award, completed her doctorate at The Catholic University of America in 1974. Her paper is an exposition of the changes and trends in the way women were viewed in higher education counseling through an important sixteen-year period which culminates in the women's liberation movement. To order, write: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Robert McAfee Brown

Interpretations and Views of Students Searching for Beliefs

Why has the spirit of conscience characterizing the Sixties disappeared? Reasons are examined and the emerging values of students and educators challenged.

I suppose it is inevitable that in dealing with student attitudes and concerns today we compare the present group of students with those of the early seventies or the late sixties, or even the middle sixties. Selma was precisely a decade ago. "Cambodia Spring" was half a decade ago. And I believe that how one feels about what is going on now, or not going on now, is in part at least determined by how one felt about what was very definitely going on during this last volatile decade. Our assessment of the "Vietnam generation" colors, I am suggesting, our assessment of the present generation. I would not labor the point, save for the fact that our local San Francisco *Chronicle* recently ran a syndicated column by Fr. Andrew Greeley, lambasting the entire Vietnam generation. I do not want to dignify his comments by too much attention, for I think they were irrational, ill-deserved and almost hysterically inaccurate, but they did serve to remind me that a lot of people still look upon those who refused to kill dark-skinned Asians as somehow demented, or at least (to use one of Fr. Greeley's favorite words) "kooks."

Now I do not at a gut level yearn for a repetition of those harrassment-filled days and nights of police and tear gas and sit-ins and trashings. Indeed I have recently begun coming to work again through our campus without automatically counting the buildings to see which ones are still standing. Nevertheless I must record that my starting point today is one of admiration for a kind of integrity and single-mindedness that characterized most students during the turbulent sixties. On the issues of racism and civil rights and the immorality of senseless warfare, they sensitized the consciences of their elders, and finally of their nation, and by their willingness to pay a price for their convictions (be it exile or jail or public scorn of the sort that Fr. Greeley is still heaping on them) they upped the ante for many of the rest of us, leaving us troubled in our complacency and frequently moved to new levels of engagement ourselves.

And, as we all know, that spirit disappeared. From all quarters we get the word that the campuses are "quiet". What happened? I will not linger over answers, for those in themselves could provide the material for an entire speech. I mention only some of the reasons we hear most commonly, as an entré into the theme of campus concerns of the moment. There are at least two cynical answers to questions about the dissipation of the moral fervor of war protest. One is that as soon as the immediacy of the draft was removed from college students, and

---

Robert McAfee Brown is Professor of Religion at Stanford University. Professor Brown is a recipient of the Harbison Award of the Danforth Foundation for distinguished teaching. His teaching and writing have focused on the integration of theological thought among belief systems and with other disciplines. During Vatican II he served as an official Protestant observer.

their own skins were safe, they stopped worrying about the southeast Asians, whose skins, as we now read daily, are far from safe. The other cynical answer is that in recent years admissions officers have carefully screened out potential radicals and denied them admission; golfers are safer than debaters, so the theory goes.

SOME BETTER ANSWERS

I think there are some better answers. One is that we are a generation that got psychically exhausted by the constancy of protest; being against something all the time is very wearing, especially when there is so little to be *for.* This may not be particularly admirable (southeast Asians have not had the privilege of psychic exhaustion) but I think for many campuses it is descriptive. Another reason for the apparent lack of moral concern is the dismay of students in discovering how short-lived were the changes they thought would herald a new day, and the shifty fashion in which officials can say one thing ("peace with honor") and do another thing (continuing war with nothing but dishonor). I think, thirdly, that some students today, looking at what has hapened to their activist predecessors, are not overly impressed that those predecessors got it all put together very well, since many of them are themselves settling into the kind of moral lethargy they so stridently decried a few years back.

THE SEARCH FOR BELIEFS

With that background, let me describe a few things that seem to me to characterize the student's search for beliefs or values on the campus today, reminding you again that I see only a small segment of students on only one campus, and that such extrapolations as I make must not be taken too seriously.

Let me first comment on what might be called *the new cynicism.* Don't respond that this is merely a gloomy theme. The very existence of cynicism is a kind of reverse tribute to idealism. The cynic is one who once thought it could be different, and now fears it can't be. He or she cares, or at least once cared. Whether that almost-extinguished flame of caring can be fanned back to life and warmth I don't yet know. But don't write off the late-teenage cynic as an unfeeling person; the chances are he or she cares so much that it's too painful to let it be known: too many things that might have been cherished have been spoiled. Watergate is only the most obvious symbol of this; its disenchanting quality to our youth has never been more poignantly mirrored than in the exchange between a member of Senator Ervin's committee and Gordon Strachan, who got badly burned by his White House connections, and when asked what advice he would have for youth going into politics, as a result of his experience, replied, "I'd tell them not to go." There is nothing to be gained here by flailing such dead horses as Agnew, Mitchell, Nixon, Haldeman, Erlichman, Dean and company — they emerged as small men bewitched by power; what is most disturbing, perhaps, is that students look at them and react, "We were always told that politics was corrupt; now we know that it is."

The same syndrome is more importantly illustrated by recent revelations about the CIA. I can remember the disbelief with which most students heard our campus radicals five or six years ago, when at rally after rally the radicals told them such atrocious lies as that the CIA was dictating the policy of foreign governments, that it engineered assassinations of politicians we didn't like, that it bribed public officials overseas, that it engaged in spying on war protestors ("domestic surveillance" is the phrase now used), and all the rest. "What nonsense," the bulk of the students replied, "in the land of the free and the home of the brave! That's

what Communist countries do!" And now we know that the radicals were not exaggerating; they were merely correct. If anything, their indictment was too muted. Is it any wonder there is cynicism around today? There is a great deal about which to be cynical.

There is something good about all this, of course. It is that students today at least see the world as it is, warts and all. There are no rose-colored glasses on campus any more, and there is, in this new cynicism, at least a kind of healthy protection against further waves of disillusionment. If you have never entertained illusions, at least they can't be taken away from you. But it is dispiriting as well, for it suggests that the ethic of the jungle is the only realistic ethic, or at least the ethic of informed and careful deception, an ethic that allows one to be manipulative of others as the only reasonable course toward one's own survival.

But I do not want to linger too long over the cynicism. It's real, it's there, and I doubt if anyone would seriously challenge its presence. What is more important, is where the new cynicism leads. And I suggest for the moment that it can lead to either conformism or despair. Perhaps conformism is too strong or pejorative a word. Let me say, rather, that cynicism leads students to do what it is expected that students on a campus will do.

THE NEW ACADEMIC SERIOUSNESS

That means that a second characteristic of students today is *the new academic seriousness.* Educators profess amazement, along with a certain gratification, that students are studying once again. I have a faculty colleague who was recently visited by an old friend who had a son in the Stanford freshman class. The father arrived in town unexpectedly on Saturday evening and decided to try to locate his son. Where do you start, on a Saturday evening to locate a freshman son on a campus of eleven thousand people, when there is no answer at the dormitory phone? To my friend's amazement, the father said, "Let's try the library." To my friend's even greater amazement, not only did they find the freshman son right off, but they found about seven hundred other freshmen as well. I cannot help but contrast this with an interdisciplinary seminar in which I was involved in the hectic year of 1967. Not only did the students revolt at the thought of professors telling them what to read, but they revolted even more at our suggestion that they read books. Books were already out of date by the time they were published. It takes a year to write a book and another year to get it published. Mimeographed materials, perhaps, on which the ink was still damp . . . but books? Hell, no.

I am not about to engage in a putdown of academic seriousness. It is important that students want to recover the heritage of the past; to know what ideas have mattered in other periods of human history, if for no other reason than in intuitive response to Santayana's dictum that those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. So I rejoice in the fact that books are read, and sometimes not merely absorbed but even digested, that thoughtful term papers are written, and that rudimentary acknowledgement of the rules of syntax and grammar is once again beginning to manifest itself in examination papers. And I am further encouraged at the thought that attention to the life of the mind could produce a new thoughtfulness, a new sense of the moral values that deserve to be learned and passed on, a new view of the world with all of its complexities and challenges.

But there is another side to this as well, and we of all peole need to be aware of it. For I have a fear that some of the new academic seriousness is not for the acquisition of knowledge, but merely of *expertise;* not to acquire wisdom but merely

know-how. There is a danger that undergraduate education will more and more become vocational training for specific jobs, rather than an experience to liberate and discipline the mind for whatever kind of life lies ahead. All freshmen know that there is a terrible vocational crunch. They know that a B.A. in medieval literature isn't worth a dime on the job market. They know that most of the people they expect to compete with will be going on to graduate school. Q.E.D.: the real purpose of an undergraduate education is to get one into graduate school. Courses translate

Some of the new academic seriousness is not for the acquisition of knowledge, but merely of expertise; not to acquire wisdom but merely know-how.

into grades, grades transfer onto transcripts, and transcripts are the magic key to the master's degree or the doctoral degree, whether in electrical engineering or business management or law or medicine — or medieval literature . . . where it is likely to turn out that everybody in the field got tenure a decade ago.

A number of years ago Stanford, like most other places, instituted a pass/no credit option for courses outside the major. Many students availed themselves of it, as a way to study what they were interested in without the rat-race competition with people who were majors in those areas. Today, one gets few takers for the pass/no credit option. The reason: such a grade doesn't look good on the transcript of someone trying competitively to get into the ninth law school of his or her choice.

I'm not sure exactly what we can do about all of this. Let us first of all be alert to it, and let us try to see that, in spite of themselves and us, students are exposed to ideas in our classrooms and not merely to information. Let us not penalize the non-conformist, and let us encourage fresh thinking; perhaps then the new academic seriousness can work for good and not only for ill.

THE NEW DESPAIR

I suggested that the new cynicism could lead toward conformism, of which, at its worst, the new academic seriousness could be one result. I now suggest that the new cynicism can become even more turned in upon itself and lead to a deeper malady that I will call *the new despair.* I truly do not know how widespread this is, but I feel that it must be given some attention. The new despair I sense not on the part of the ordinary student, but on the part of the deeply committed, the truly concerned. And I think what induces it is an engulfing sense of the sheer immensity of the problems we confront. Tick them off, all with a doomsday sense about them: world hunger, population increase, racism, war, depersonalization, the growing gap between rich and poor. They are all there, they all cry out for solution, and they appear insoluble. We cannot attack one until we attack them all, we must attack them one at a time, so immediate are they. Where do we start? What can we do? There seem to be no "handles", no clear points of departure, no immediate grasp on such matters.

This sense of frustration and powerlessness must be particularly apparent to members of minority groups. Here I am, a quintessential WASP, and I feel this despair. What must it be like to the Chicano, or the Black, or the native American, or the Asian-American, or whoever, who does not have powerful lobbies working for him or her, who does not get preferential attention in real estate or schooling, and who now finds, after a few years in which some kind of remedial affirmative action was being taken, that even those token gestures are beginning to be

withdrawn, or are creating such powerful backlash that the last state may turn out to be worse than the first?

For a while, many students were responding to this sense of the resistent nature of our institutions by dropping out. The counter-culture theme was powerful. Dormitories are a drag? Try communes. Jobs are a rat-race? Try hitchhiking on the money you've saved. I still think some important things can come out of small group experiments, and I'm sorry that so many of them seem to have folded, particularly when it means that those thereby disillusioned tend to get swallowed up again in the vast impersonalization of our large social structures.

But, if we are going to handle this problem of despair at the possibility of changing anything before doomsday comes, I think a lot of the responsibility is going to have to be placed on our colleges and universities. Are they simply going to mirror the vast impersonal changeless structures of the rest of society? Can educational structures be humanized, or not? You remember that favorite placard in the marches of the 60s? "I am a person. Do not fold, bend, mutilate or spindle." Aren't we more and more treating people as numbers, or as IBM cards? How do students get fouled up these days with the Registrar? Isn't it frequently the case that the *computer* made a mistake? As long as students find universities unresponsive to human needs, they will have no reason to feel that anything beyond, such as the Justice Department or the White House or General Motors, is likely to be responsive to human needs.

Will students really be led to believe in human and humane possibilities if they see their professors engaged in a cutthroat tenure competition where the resources of the most brilliant intellects have to be directed toward survival techniques? Can they really expect life in the corporation to be any different? Is there a way in which a college or university community could begin to embody some of the things it talks about in the classroom? Can a skeletal dean's staff really deal with ten thousand students in more than mechanized ways? Will we not have to raise some fundamental questions about *the style of life* of the college or university, if we expect to product anything but students for whom despair is the overriding reality?

THE NEW PERMISSIVENESS

There is another direction in which the search for beliefs can go. It can be channeled into what is sometimes called *the new permissiveness,* though just how "new" this is (especially in the realm of sexual *mores*) is an open question. Let us give this its due. At its best, the breaking down of old *mores,* the experimentation in new modes of human relationship is a desperate search for companionship and even for love. So many of our old social patterns created artificial barriers between people and between the sexes, and loneliness was the order of the day for many.

I was talking recently with the dean of a small southern denominational college. He had had occasion to tangle with a group of students who had, in his terms, been "carousing around" far too much. "Why do you do it?" he asked one of them finally, as much out of curiosity as of exasperation. The reply, he reported, was instantaneous: "I just want to find out if there is *one person* who will love me for who I am." That speaks volumes about the constraints we have erected around human relationships out of ill-defined fears that too much openness will be destructive.

W. H. Auden has a poem in which he compares (in a fashion that shocks many people) the holy communion and the cocktail party. The former once united people

to one another and to God. The latter is a desperate secular counterpart of an attempt at least to unite people with one another, employing human spirits in the absence of any Holy Spirit.

I'm not saying that what we need are more Beta Beer blasts or *Harrad Experiments.* I am saying that we need to hear in the new permissiveness a cry of loneliness that seeks all kinds of ways to render its cry unnecessary.

The sad thing, of course, is how futile so much of the experimentation is, and how badly people are hurt. We are beginning to learn that the "liberation" of hard drugs was never that, but a new bondage, the results of which may be bequeathed to genetically-mangled grandchildren. And the desperate search for the new physical thrill, whether sexual or simply riding faster in a car than one has ridden before — such attempts have no satisfactory ceiling, for each new level once attained

If, in this relatively manageable environment (colleges and universities) of limited numbers and limited space, we cannot find new possibilities to further community, in what ways can we expect students to create community in the infinitely more vast arenas to which they will emigrate after graduation?

is no longer an achievement but now a commonplace that must be surpassed next time. Even the creator of the hard core porno movies, for which this fair city of San Francisco is so famous, said recently that he was going to do just one more, and then there would be nothing left to do or to show that hadn't already been done or shown, and that would be the end of pornographic films. I believe his insight to be correct even though his prediction for his fellow film makers may be faulty.

But in addition to the fact that there are finite limits to the extension of thrills, there is the further fact, which students often discover the hard way, that this route is so frequently manipulative of others, and ends up not with new satisfactions but with abiding hurts. It is the old game of treating persons as things, and the one who does that becomes more and more a thing himself or herself.

Here again, the enemy appears to be depersonalization. Can our colleges and universities become places where people count as people and not as objects? Here is a place, perhaps above all places, where students themselves need to be involved in the creation of more humanizing structures on our campuses. If, in this relatively manageable environment of limited numbers in a limited space, we cannot find new possibilities to further community, in what ways can we expect students to create community in the infinitely more vast arenas to which they will emigrate after graduation?

MANIFESTATIONS OF STUDENT CONCERNS

Let me turn now to a couple of manifestations of student concern as these are expressed in more overtly religious terms. I will mention two of them. One is what I must, to be descriptively accurate, call the *new/old Zen kick.* This has been around for a while, and it is my perception that it is waning. By the term I don't mean to knock Zen, or Buddhism. I use it merely as a shorthand device for the deep fascination that oriental religion has had for many students seeking to put life together. There was some of this during the frenetic 60's, as you will all remember. The world was rough and chaotic, and there was something very reassuring about turning to the inner world of meditation, concern for the self, reflection on eternity rather than time, and all the rest. You will even recall that

radicals of the 60's like Rennie Davis, one of the founders of S.D.S., have turned to oriental meditation as a formula for the 70's. The trip has never had much attraction for me personally, so I must be careful not to write it off too easily. I pay tribute to the admirable serenity that some people have developed through this kind of meditation of withdrawal, that has helped them cope with the rough exigencies of every day that otherwise might have done them in. And I think we need, desperately, in our time, a new sense of the appreciation of the natural order, that such perspectives often provide. There is, among the eastern religions, a less rapacious attitude toward using nature for our own technological and consumer-oriented ends that may be a crucial ingredient in our very survival on this plundered planet. So we need to learn from such perspectives.

But the gains are not without their costs. The chief cost, it seems to me, is the temptation simply to turn one's back on other people, to set one's own inner serenity as the highest good, quite apart from what happens to the bleeding, starving children of men outside of one's immediate orbit of inner togetherness. There can be something exotic, if not quixotic, in the ease with which we can fashion a meditative world that allows no rude realities of human need to intrude upon it. And there is the temptation to jump too quickly in new directions. (Mort Sahl describes a west coast fifteen-year-old explaining the attraction of eastern forms of meditation: "The gods of the west have failed me.")

The other religious dimension that bears notice on the present scene is what I will call, perhaps a bit unfairly, *the new fundamentalism.* This phenomenon has been observable on many campuses — the resurgence of what is variously called "conservative evangelicalism", "evangelical Protestantism", or something of the sort. As a national movement it is well orchestrated from a number of centers with a large group of full-time workers, coming from such groups as Campus Crusade for Christ, Young Life, Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, and others. It is

There can be something exotic, if not quixotic, in the ease with which we can fashion a meditative world that allows no rude realities of human need to intrude upon it.

strongly Biblical, based on the importance of individual conversion to Jesus Christ, and creates closely-knit supportive fellowships that engage in Bible study, prayer, and personal evangelism. In a world that is shot through with ambiguity and lack of clarity, this faith offers clear simple answers for the overcoming of a sense of personal inadequacy, lack of direction, and sin. This is surely its strength — clarity, single-mindedness, and an ability to lift people out of despondency or meaninglessness, in such a way that its adherents feel called upon to share it with others. Those strengths are also its potential weaknesses, i.e. that the single-mindedness may fail to take account of real ambiguities, (the world is *not* simple) that the call to share may come off as triumphalistic or imperialistic, and that the sense of personal transformation may not issue in any concern for social transformation. My own experience with members of these groups is that when those who have discovered "good news" inside themselves later on discover a world outside themselves, a world that needs help and care whether its residents become Christian or not, then something quite powerful is released, and the joining of inner and outer concerns becomes a significant new input on the scene.

These movements are widespread. They have grown up independently of the more mainline "campus ministry" approaches that have historically been supported by major American denominations, and they now appear to be moving to center

stage in terms of the numbers they are attracting. Attempts at new communication between the evangelicals and the main line groups are underway; these may lead to some new levels of understanding, and they are very important in terms of a possible dialogue about the relationships on campus of Christians and Jews, since ill will is often engendered when certain zealous evangelicals move in on Hillel groups as particularly attractive conversion territory.

THE NEW ETHNICITY

At this point it becomes clear that I am in danger of speaking too much from a middle-class perspective. So let me mention a sixth trend that might be called *the new ethnicity,* the self-conscious identification of members of minority groups with one another. This began most clearly with the Black Student Unions, particularly in the wake of Martin Luther King's death, when blacks pushed, successfully, for a measure of special compensatory treatment, in terms of new scholarships, recruitment programs, black studies programs, remedial tutorial work and the like. Similar groups have emerged around native Americans, Asian-Americans, Chicanos, and others. Theme houses, special courses, and special considerations for members of these groups, have been an important component of campus life in recent years. The feminist movement can also be put in this category, as women students have become increasingly aware of the disadvantages under which they labor in admissions policies, housing, athletics, and so forth. One has to say (particularly when one is part of that beleagured group on campuses today, white males) that such compensatory measures are long overdue and are surely in the interests of broader social justice. We are now entering, however, as a recent court decision has made clear, into an era in which the theme of "reverse discrimination" may begin to be prominently heard, as white males claim that they are denied entrance into graduate school or the teaching profession, since members of minority groups and women are given first pick. The issue is a tricky one ethically, were there not the long history of discrimination against the very groups that are only now beginning to get a semblance of fair treatment. What is now beginning to be the lot of some white males has been the lot of the other groups for generations. How different campus interests stand on this issue appears to be a matter of whose ox is being gored.

THE NEW HOPE

Let me propose a final theme: there is also on our campuses, though it is a little harder to find, what might be called *the new hope.* I cannot tell you just where it will turn up, but it may turn up where you least expect it. And when it is nowhere to be found, one has the feeling that it is what is most needed. To have hope is to believe in the future, to believe that what now is need not set the exclusive pattern for what shall be; it is to affirm that new things can happen, that nothing is irrevocably foreordained. Where does it come from? More important, how can we nurture it?

I am one of those who believes that the religious traditions that have been part of our American experience, notably Christianity and Judaism, can foster and sustain such hope, and if I were talking to a religious convention now of either Christians or Jews, my theme would be to discern ways in which our traditions could once again nurture hope in a time of such deep despair. But this is a group of educators, quite apart from whether or not a random sampling of you may or may not be involved in church or synagogue. So my question must be, "Can our colleges and universities be breeding grounds for hope? Can they be places where the values that are embodied by hope can be instilled in their constituents?"

Two caveats before I tackle the question directly. First, I do not believe that values are "instilled." We do not say, "Go to, now, we will create a course on hope and people will thereby become hopeful." Such things are not — in an almost threadbare distinction — taught, so much as they are caught. I will not believe in hope — or love or compassion or sacrifice, or the other great values that distinguish us in our humanity — because somebody defines them for me, or teaches me about them, but rather because somebody embodies them for me. And the second caveat, a hard one for most educators to swallow, is a reminder that knowledge is not virtue. Teaching the right is no guarantee that those taught will do the right. There is just too much descriptive existential truth in the observation (if I may be allowed one Biblical quotation) of St. Paul, that "the good that I would, I do not, the evil that I would not, that I do." "I know what is right," Paul goes on, "but I do not do it." And I think a great deal of our education has proceeded on the assumption that to know the good is to do it. But we have learned, those

Many of the values by which colleges and universities operate are covert rather than overt.

of us for whom the Hitler generation is more than a dim memory, that increase of knowledge need not mean increase of virtue; it may mean increase of knowledge that can be used for diabolical ends. We may not assume that imparting of knowledge will be for the good: and exhorting that it be used for good ends will not be enough, particularly if we give no particular evidence that we ourselves are using it for good ends.

So, if we are to talk about hope, to concern ourselves with values in higher education, we are in a very frail position. We may be unleashing demons — sophisticated, intelligent, well-educated demons.

There is no way to fully guard against that. But as my previous comments have hinted, I suggest that our best defense against such culpability lies in the degree that we not only speak about, but in our institutional life *embody* those things which we hold precious. This may sound like a bromide, but I mean it in all seriousness, for, if my earlier analysis is sound, we have a group of students who see through hypocrisy with keen and piercing eyes, and for whom the saying of one thing and the doing of something contrary is a double iniquity.

A recent instance comes to mind. A member of the Board of Trustees of a university where a friend of mine teaches, wrote an essay about the necessity for honesty in educational life, deploring the lack of standards on the campus of his choice. An admirable theme — there is a lot of dishonesty, intellectual and moral, on most campuses, and we would all be better off without it. But by the time this particular piece appeared in the local campus press, its author had been identified as an official in a bank that had been engaging in the giving of secret loans to the government of South Africa. Do you think the students didn't see through that one in an instant? Not only were they outraged that a representative of their institution was helping to finance *apartheid,* but they were doubly incensed that the matter had been done secretly through what in other circumstances we have learned to call the "laundering" of dirty money.

So I am saying that if we want to command the loyalty of our students, and if we want to make it possible for them to be other than cynical or despairing or conforming or whatever, then to a greater degree than has been true in the

past, our words must match our deeds — better yet, our deeds must match our words, for we have some very good words. Are there places where in a significant degree that could happen? (As I prepare to respond, I am reminded of the high church Anglican cleric, who was also a realist, and who once said, "I believe in one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, and sincerely regret that it does not exist.")

What are the kinds of realities that might make "the new hope" something more than a vain hope or a pious hope or an unrealistic hope?

Can we really talk about education as the key to the good life and at the same time put a price tag on that education so high, that only the very rich and the very poor can afford to attend?

Can we really talk about the whole person being our concern, when our procedures become more and more impersonal and our structures less and less receptive to the oddly original individual who doesn't fit the standard profiles?

Can we really educate and not merely inform, if we are content to produce technicians rather than thinkers?

Can we think of ourselves as related to the world of the 1970's if we choose to concentrate only on the 18-25-year age group, and fail to realize that education is now going to have to be a lifelong venture?

Can we talk about being "relevant" (blessed and damnable word) as long as we ignore the value-assumptions that are positively loaded on all the actions and policies that we claim are value-free?

Let me expand that last question to conclude: I know there are many educators who want to stay away from the question of values, because the terrain gets so tangled and so many special interests immediately rush in to stake out a claim to it, promising that their nostrums will bring order out of the chaos. I urge, on the contrary, that not only must we not avoid this question of the values we are trying to embody in higher education, but that we must affirm them more openly than we have before. Let me suggest three short steps into this problem that you can then pursue in your own thinking at another time.

1. Colleges and universities are (if I may employ a vulgarism) in the values game, whether they like it or not. We decide all the time that some things are more important than other things and we make those decisions on the basis of at least an implicit value structure: a gym is more important than a new wing on the library; a Black Studies program is more important than squash courts; Professor X should get tenure rather than Professor Y.

2. When we begin to pursue such questions, what we discover, of course, is not that some people have values and some do not, but that the real name of the game is competing values and value systems. There is a consistent value orientation that will argue for gyms and squash courts against libraries and Black Studies programs, and vice versa. Different value systems are in operation when a physics department decides to invest in equipment to deal with human blindness rather than compete for a Defense Department contract to improve the automated battlefield.

3. The further we push such questions, the more we discover that many of the values by which colleges and universities operate are covert rather than overt.

The choices are implicit but often not explicit. To buy into a technological future unthinkingly because that is the way the future seems to be going, or represents where the money is, is a value assumption that ought to be questioned at least, even if it is ultimately adopted: What is such a choice saying about the human person in that technological future? Are we creating new freedoms or new constraints? Is bigness necessarily better than what precedes it?

So the task, it seems to me, is to smoke out the value assumptions behind the decisions we make, as administrators, as teachers, as students. Are we really in education to help free up the whole person, or are we in education to keep a particular institution (our own) operating at peak efficiency, regardless of what it is doing to the students we are "processing"? Indeed, should not some benevolent power strike us dead the next time we refer to "processing" a student? Are our administrative structures such that they would ever make it possible to indicate a sense of caring for the students that try to work their way through the mazes we create?

The argument may seem nebulous. It must remain so. My purpose is not today to push my own value system. My purpose most emphatically *is* to urge you to examine the value structure you already have, even if you don't think about it much — get it out in the harsh light of day, see whether it is worthy of critical scrutiny, especially by others, and be willing, if necessary, to overhaul it. Try some other value assumptions on for size, and see how they relate to yours. Here, for example, are some shorthand expressions, each of which would lead in radically different educational policy directions:

- We can only educate a few; they must lead the rest.
- Scientific methods are the only things left that can save us.
- We are part of a global family in which every one has unique worth.
- Ask not what your country can do for you; as what you can do for yourself.
- Man is the measure of all things.

And so on. You spend long hours at your desk, and longer hours in interminable committee meetings. To what end? For what purpose? To enhance what values?

Those are questions addressed to us. We started out talking about students. Now we are talking about ourselves. Have we surreptitiously been shifted over onto another track? No. If the work we do is going to have any meaning in the lives of students, other than a destructive meaning, it will be because the work we do has some kind of inner integrity to it, because it is enhancing values that should endure.

If it has that inner integrity, it is for me an article of faith that it will elicit on the part of students and others a creative response.

King V. Cheek, Jr.

The Impact of National Trends in Higher Education

An increase of social power among new constituencies and new institutions forecasts necessary movement toward a further humanizing of higher education.

The winds of change in higher education are blowing with increasing velocity. We witness the tension between two opposing forces. On the one hand, we continue to observe the tendency to support vested interests, entrenchment of faculties, adversary relationships between administrators and faculty as evidenced by increased unionization and other developments which cause us to wonder if the student is our principal or dominant concern.

On the other hand, we view the movements toward learner-centered education, off-campus learning, egalitarian policies which open access to previously disenfranchised populations and, in general, a new kind of campus which seeks to humanize the total educational enterprise.

Much has been written and spoken about the new campus. The summary report of The Carnegie Commission suggests that higher education communities will never again be what they once were. The implication is that the changes occurring and forecast are dramatically unsettling and disturbing to many.

A brief survey of these changes would be instructive.

No longer are colleges simply viewed as places where 18 to 22 year olds come to listen to lectures, take notes, write examinations, and emerge four years later with a degree. The assumptions which were sacred for so long are now challenged and in many cases abandoned. The assumptions that everything must be taught instead of learned; that four years and time spent are inviolable criteria for awarding a degree; that if you haven't had a course in it you haven't learned it; that rote memory and course content are more important than the process of learning. All of these now are under severe attack.

The college-age student population is changing. The student constituency is becoming more diversified as older persons, employees, parents, husbands, and wives are enrolling in large numbers. As this student clientele has changed, so have our attitudes toward students undergone modifications.

At one time we distinguished between persons who went to work and those who went to college. Young adults who went to work were able to cut the parental umbilical cord, get apartments, and live outside older adult scrutiny and control. Those who went to college were not so privileged. Different assumptions were made about their adulthood. We thought they still needed the controls their working peers had abandoned.

King V. Cheek, Jr., is an attorney and currently serving as Vice President for Planning and Program Development of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities. Formerly he held the presidencies of Morgan State College and Shaw University.

With the decline of *in loco parentis* in student life, these assumptions were discarded. We can foresee the day when *in loco parentis* in all of academic life will be non-existent and new relationships between student and teacher will emerge.

There also has been a shift from the education of the elite to universal access, with greater attention given to achieving equity and parity for blacks, women, and other minorities. Racism and sexism continue to be the objects of attack both in academic policies and curriculums. Open enrollment and the push toward equity require profound adjustments in our academic life.

The revolution in modes of instruction and learning is beginning to rearrange the lives and relationships of students and teachers. University without walls, credit by examination, external degrees, co-operative education, and other learner-cen-

. . . the campus is becoming the city, the home, the work site . . .

tered and experientially based approaches embrace a larger population, develop and utilize a more comprehensive inventory to resources, and expand the concept of faculty to include any person who has something to offer to the learning process. In some instances the campus is becoming the city, the home, the work site or wherever the student may be located.

Instructional technology also will revolutionize our educational delivery system. Dial access retrieval systems, video and audio cassettes, closed circuit TV, Cable TV, all of these new systems, and others, will transform the classroom and free both the student and the teacher from the domination of lecture-note taking relationships.

We have begun to think also of new ways to organize knowledge and new ways of knowing. Learning no longer may be confined to the traditionally organized disciplines as the world of work itself provides an interdisciplinary laboratory enabling the learner to integrate the contributions of knowledge from many fields into a meaningful and relevant whole.

New financial models for the support of higher education are beginning to emerge. The economic depression which higher education experienced in the late sixties and early seventies has inspired a reexamination of the ways in which learning resources are utilized. The trends and innovations represent an attack upon the rigid mind-set which not only governed and restricted the mode of delivery of educational services, but also restricted and determined the beneficiaries of those services.

Of subtle, and often not so subtle, influence on many of these developments have been the federal and state governments. More and more, education, and those given responsibility for managing it, has been placed in the position of public trust. Title VI and Title IX provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, financial aid policy guidelines, federal grants, and accompanying policies, judicial activism in matters once considered outside the jurisdiction of courts, activist legislators who see the need for enlightened external authority, all of these forces will join with others to keep the revolution in full swing. Higher education as an institution will be under constant public scrutiny as persons of all persuasions seek to ensure that the larger public interest is promoted and protected.

To understand completely that in part we are experiencing a revolution in values, we should describe again the current and dominant state of the art.

We have been correctly accused in higher education of perpetuating the great lie, that we aspire to develop life-long learners. This objective assumes that students will develop self concepts as learners and a capacity for self-directed learning. But a simple examination reveals our students in primarily passive roles. They learn early that seeking the approval of others is a condition for academic success. The system often places a lesser premium upon personal satisfaction, than upon success as defined by others. Very few students have the opportunity to establish goals for themselves, or for self-evaluation, since the evaluation by others is the only one that counts in the credentialling struggle. Risk taking sometimes is minimized and individual initiative stifled rather than attempt creative dissent to challenge the traditional status relationship between teacher and student.

The conventional lock-step assumes that learning must be a straight jacket of fifty minute lectures, 120 semester hours, four years, and that all students must march together regardless of their different abilities. Many persons still assume that learning must take place on a geographically proscribed campus, and that there are no persons qualified to teach other than those certified (by the appropriate degree or credential) and hired on a college faculty. Prior learning experiences of students are seen by many educators as unimportant. It doesn't matter that a student already has acquired a skill of competency. "If he didn't acquire it here, it isn't certifiable."

We are also reminded by some studies that we are wasting a lot of the time students spend in high school and college. Thirty percent of the work in the freshman and sophomore college years duplicates the last two years of high school. In some quarters work service opportunities still encounter resistance. The major tragedy of all of our deficiencies is that half of the students who enter higher education never complete their programs. Many leave with busted egos and contempt for the educational process they encountered.

The new campus with its new emphasis upon the total learning environment, learner-centered options, forecasts a new condition in academic life which will make learning more exciting and contagious. These changes have profound implications for improvement in our delivery systems and support services. Let us explore these challenges.

First, universal access to higher education and emphasis upon equity for minorities will require new attitudes and learning strategies. It is immoral to maintain

Students who have suffered the neglect of a closed society require a new kind of humanism which emphasizes not just access, but which in fact, realistically promotes success.

open admissions with a revolving door. Students who have suffered the neglect of a closed society require a new kind of humanism which emphasizes not just *access,* but which, in fact, realistically promotes *success.*

Many institutions have established new compensatory programs to help guarantee that students succeed in college. In some cases the traditional methods of compensation have failed because they neglected the value of the student's ego, the emotional needs for developing self-confidence, and a need for a self-concept as a learner. In my opinion, it is important not to confront students with the fear of failure, but instead to stimulate their positive self-perceptions as educable persons. It is true that some students may be ill-located in a college, but if they are there, they must be given a full opportunity to determine this reality for

themselves. They should not be subjected to hostile and skeptical attitudes and prejudgments often based upon instruments designed to measure potential of members of majority groups. I have seen many of these programs which are viewed by the faculties which created them as homes for the intellectually indigent, rather than as opportunities for students to have their personhood restored.

The decline of *in loco parentis* creates other challenges worthy of examination. Although we have abandoned over-regulation of a student's personal life, we still enforce arbitrary rules in their academic lives. We require students to march lock-step with each other in total disregard for their different abilities.

I recall a personal experience several years ago when I was Dean of a college. I ended my day rather exhausted, and reflected upon my activities. It occurred to me that I had spent 95% of the day giving students approvals which they should never have been required to seek.

We now face the challenge of discarding *in loco parentis* in our academic institutional culture. Differential pacing in which students without penalty move at their own rate of speed is a necessary development. Individualized instruction and pacing which accounts for differences in life styles, learning styles, and abilities must become integral to our educational process. Some students may indeed demonstrate the ability to carry overloads. After all, many work 25 to 30 hours per week in addition to regular course activities. Why not permit students to exercise choice and, if they believe they can, accelerate their progress.? Why not permit students to be adults in this area of their lives also?

I have always been puzzled by the resistance to learner-centered, or self-directed, programs in which the student is also a teacher and evaluator. I have often received the answer that students are not yet ready for this freedom, for this exercise of adult responsibility. The more subtle and correct answer is that we are not prepared for what this new student responsibility and freedom means; a larger role for us to be consultants, to advise and to guide, and to enforce accountability, because we have never defined accountability for ourselves. We often project in students what we know to be our own shortcomings; the abuse of academic freedom; the failure to combine freedom with responsibility; the failure to exercise our own best judgment.

Perhaps we should consider that the ultimate liberation of students may be our own emancipation; as we free our culture of many unjustified and irrationally based rules, we also free ourselves for more creative intellectual encounters. Many of our rules restrict us as well as students, and do indeed inhibit both faculty and students from actualizing their true potential as collaborative learners.

Some persons have expressed concern that the new student culture makes it impossible for a college to influence the development of values or the emotional growth of students. This attitude is a cop out.

The Carnegie Commission's survey of student attitudes and perceptions reveals that undergraduates place a high priority upon a college promoting their emotional maturation. Students expect and want colleges to have some impact upon their personal lives, to be more than knowledge cafeterias. I do not believe students are requesting more than we can deliver. We do not need to control students' personal lives in order to influence their emotional development.

We can begin by developing environments in which personal growth can take place; by being concerned with the total learning environment and by recognizing

that students have a far more enduring impact upon each other than often their teachers have on them. We can stop creating a false picture of accountability when we maintain the protections while abandoning the controls. Students like all other persons understand ethical behavior only when they are accountable for their choices.

We can accomplish this objective if we do not abdicate our responsibilities to advise, guide, and serve as models. All the new student culture requests is that we not play God and that students be given opportunities to exercise their own judgments. We retain the responsibility to be mentors, advisors, and consultants; to make available the wisdom of our experiences; to force encounters which enable students to think their way to value positions rather than to have imprinted upon them our own set value codes.

This is the challenge of our time. We enforce more strictly the principles of accountability by withdrawing traditional parental protections and by substituting instead the protection of the student's own best judgment. It is the judgment *process,* rather than its *content,* that we are concerned with sharpening.

In this regard we are presented with enormous opportunities for mutual growth and development. For example, we are witnessing a new quest for religious values within many student camps. At a time when world events are unsettling and unpredictable, students in larger numbers are seeking new anchors on which to secure their faiths. The implications for new partnerships and creative dialogue are real. We can demonstrate that the search for justice is not the monopoly of any age group, race or sex and that generation gaps and status differences were really old excuses for not listening to each other.

Another vital dimension of the new campus is the impact of off-campus learning and learner-centered reform reflected in programs such as university without walls, co-operative education, external degrees, credit by examination and many others.

Public libraries, business corporations, and other agencies will become more heavily involved in delivering educational services and credentialling students. Learning will be put on a continuum system with different articulation points between high school and college enabling many more students to begin college work before high school graduation.

More and more, students are being given responsibility for their own learning. Education no longer is restricted to the conventional classroom. Students are more active in the learning process. They become learners and teachers simultaneously. They learn the value of self-criticism and evaluation. They are given the opportunity to integrate theoretical knowledge with the actual world of experience, and to test one against the other. They develop techniques for self-directed learning which will last throughout their lives. But more important than all of these is the impact of this educational mode upon personal values and self-concepts. Students in these programs are more likely to distinguish between *personal satisfaction,* which they define, and *success,* as defined by others.

The delivery of knowledge, in this new pedagogy, is not the end objective, rather it is an integral part of the process of learning to learn. The worth of the person is reestablished, and the impacts upon the learner become the major validation of the effectiveness and value of educational practices.

It is clear that conventional education could be greatly humanized if some of the approaches found in these new, innovative programs were adopted. There is a need for at least one caveat. Self-directed, highly independent learning arrangements may not fit the needs of all students. These programs simply represent alternatives for those whose needs are not served by traditional approaches.

These are some aspects of the emerging new campus. I foresee the day when new educational centers, unlike the present traditional college, will be added to the national educational system. Public libraries, business corporations, and other agencies will become more heavily involved in delivering educational services and credentialling students. Learning will be put on a continuum system with different articulation points between high school and college enabling many more students to begin college work before high school graduation. Almost all colleges will have self-pacing mechanisms with emphasis upon the individual learner. Time spent

Pluralism and integration may be two separate, distinct, and desirable goals . . . It will be a queer result if the 14th Amendment were used to destroy rather than enhance the vehicles for equal educational opportunities.

will cease one day to be the dominant criterion for the baccalaureate degree. Colleges and universities will become true communities where everybody is a teacher and everybody is a student.

These are hopes and dreams. But they are founded upon the expectation that the public demand will require a new level of humanism in higher education; that higher education will be recognized as the most effective vehicle for breaking the cycle of poverty and promoting equal opportunity; that higher education will become a vital instrument of justice (to help insure that the hardships suffered by parents will not handicap their children); that all persons may be able to make or shape their futures on the basis of their individual merit, without the anti-humanist handicaps of race, sex, economic or social conditions.

What should be the role of student affairs offices in responding to, and in promoting, these trends of reform? Personally, I have some very heavy biases based not upon empirical research, but upon my brief experience as an educator. I believe it is desirable to eliminate structural status distinctions between faculty and student affairs officers. On many campuses the only real power holders are the faculty. They give to themselves an importance which, quite frankly, they do not deserve. Faculty are the only ones to create a tenure system which makes demonstrated competence irrelevant for continued employment. The fact is that student affairs officers often have a greater impact upon a student's personal development than do faculty. The reason is that the main student affairs officers are more concerned with the total learning environment than just with classroom instruction.

The time has gone when student affairs professionals can be viewed in the role of guardian or disciplinarian. They are more correctly considered Deans and Vice Presidents of Educational Services, rather than in the restrictive context of Deans of Men, and Women, or Students. Faculties are jealous of their power in curricular and academic programming. Unless forced, they are not inclined to share their power.

I once visited a campus as a consultant and reviewed the tremendous gap between the Academic Affairs Division and the Division of Student Services. They seldom talked to one another. At the conclusion of my visit I remarked to the assembly

of administrators and faculty that I saw two distinct groups, with two different attitudes and behavioral patterns. I characterized the faculty as academicians and the Student Service Officers as educators. I believe the distinction was more profound than they understood.

I certainly do not want to suggest that this is the pattern of all campuses, but wherever these artificial status differences exist, they impede the collaborative approach to learning and education.

I, therefore, recommend that all colleges and universities should ensure that Student Service Officers are power holders within the academic decision making structure. They will then be in a more effective strategic position to influence reform. In some instances it may even be desirable to eliminate the distinction between the two divisions, the academic and student services, and consider them as one, with the roles of all less rigidly defined. Under this arrangement power is shared, dialogue is encouraged, and the two groups, which in some cases seldom communicate, will understand the varying dimensions of each others commitments and seek to influence the other.

In the position of a power holder student service officers, where they have not before, should assume the role of student advocate. The power of students to affect real change is more fancied than real. They are put on committees, but time priorities inhibit effective participation. More importantly, students are transient. Change takes time. Students seldom are able to provide the necessary consistency or continuity. Thus student-centered interests must be promoted by a power-holding group. Student consumerism rapidly is becoming a major issue as more students insist that the academy live up to its promises of accountability. We can avoid the adversarial roles between students and other groups within the campus if we become activists in asserting rights and eliminating injustices; if we view our roles as being learning facilitators in the truest meaning of that term.

I would also suggest that we analyze carefully the significance of the trend toward governmental and lay influence on the direction of higher education. The academy no longer is immune to public view and criticism. Courts now assume jurisdiction in areas they once disregarded. Legislators view higher education as a public trust, and in some instances treat colleges as public utilities.

The reasons are clear. Enlightened external authority is viewed by many as the only answer to educational acountability in the interest of the public. Colleges and

Student centered interests must be promoted by a power holding group . . . we can avoid the adversarial roles between students and other groups within the campus if we become activists in asserting rights and eliminating injustices . . .

universities were once closed, elite societies in which faculty and administrators reigned like kings and queens in their castles, incapable of error and immune to criticism. That day is passing. The concept of educational justice is a new dynamic derived from the larger pursuit of social justice. Title VI and IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 impose new affirmative duties, and cast colleges and universities in roles of social change agents which historically they have never assumed. They now have the duty to help eliminate racism, and all the badges and vestiges of slavery, and to counter the negative cultural socialization reflected by sexism.

There are several cautions which should be highlighted as alliances are created with the larger community which we serve. One is the fear that colleges and universities could become politicized and lose their roles as critics of society and as hostels for persons with varying points of view. Another important concern is that the pursuit of educational justice for black citizens especially could result in lessening, rather than increasing, educational opportunity. This strange twist has its origin in the *Adams* vs. *Richardson* decision which mandates the elimination of social duality in higher education. Though the latter is a necessary and desirable goal, the process used to accomplish it could result, if not carefully managed, in the elimination of large members of black colleges and universities. This would be a catastrophic loss to our nation.

Time does not permit me to analyze in depth all of the dimensions of this problem. I simply wish to emphasize that black colleges and universities have been vital national resources. Black colleges are more than educational institutions. They represent power, possession, and pride for a disenfranchised people, and cannot be replaced by other institutions in our society.

I suggest that those of us who have responsibilities for implementing Title VI understand that pluralism and integration may be two separate, distinct, and desirable goals. Their simultaneous pursuit may require action which protects the existence of black colleges. It will be a queer result indeed if the 14th Amendment were used to destroy rather than enhance the vehicles for equal education opportunity.

I have not presented an exhaustive treatment for all of the trends in higher education. Only a few have been mentioned. It is important that we understand that higher education is undergoing a rather quiet, steady, and oftentimes subtle revolution. Student affairs professionals must both understand and seek to influence needed reform.

Higher education is being redefined now as never before. That redefinition, in summary, embraces:

- *A New Clientele* — populations of new learners who heretofore were disenfranchised and excluded.
- *A New Pedagogy* — including off-campus, learner-centered instruction and other innovative programs.
- *A New Inventory of Resources* — beyond the conventional classroom and laboratories to include community resources and the world of work.
- *A New Knowledge Content and Organization* — or new ways of knowing.
- *A New Relationship* — among the participants with students, faculty and administrators forced into more collaborative roles.
- *A New Advocacy Role* — as colleges become more vital instruments for social reform by elimination of injustices such as sexism and racism.

All of these developments should have the common objective of humanizing the learning environment. In order to make this objective a reality, those of us in this assembly and all others committed to learning must be prepared to do more than remodel the chapel. We may be called upon to reform the church. The price we pay for not responding could very well be an epitaph for colleges, similar to that for the dinosaur.

We do not know why the dinosaur became extinct. All we do know is that something changed and the dinosaur didn't.